



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

for many years, and, once elected, the electors have no control over him. Since the parliamentary machine is breaking down, the world is faced with chaos unless the "workers" have a new system to replace it. That system is the soviet system, the Council of Workers' Delegates. That is the argument.

One naturally wonders what the difference is between a "capitalist" and a "worker." One also naturally wonders what kind of a world this would be if it were run by people who, as "The Billiken" says, submit so supinely to the "spiritual and mental control" which the "malefactors" so successfully exercise. The "worker" who so naturally assimilates the poison gently administered by the "masters," if such "workers" there be, does not somehow command our enthusiastic hope in a society governed by him. If our journalism, science, art, and literature be "prostitutes," what of him? If, in addition to this servility, he be thriftless, wanting in frugality, lacking in industry, and wholly intemperate, irreverent, disobedient, fearing not hell, we are afraid he would have trouble getting himself elected to office. Defiance and discontent could not possibly win him enough votes to get into any office save, perhaps, that of an inmate in the county jail. It does not appear that such "workers" are liable to get what they want, namely, "the old earth and its riches for themselves." Then, too, one naturally wonders where the money comes from for the distribution of "The Billiken." There seems to be a capitalistic gentleman of color in the Soviet woodpile.

NEWS OF PATRICK HENRY

NEW EVIDENCE has just been brought to public attention which tends to show that Patrick Henry did not rise "to a loftier attitude, and fixing on the speaker an eye of the most determined fire," thunder, "And George the Third may profit by their example. If this be treason, make the most of it," but something quite the contrary. Indeed, he is now pictured as asking pardon on that occasion for mentioning Tarquin, Cæsar, and Charles the First in connection with George III. The document just brought to light, which reveals Henry as most loyal to His Majesty King George III, has all the appearance of a discovery of real importance. It will be something of a sad blow for the many who have been brought up under the glow of that alleged defiance, but the new evidence is very convincing. It now looks as if we must expunge that oft-quoted speech from our history and eliminate at least the climax of it from our erstwhile patriotic prepossessions.

The document to which we refer, called "*Journal of a French Traveller in the Colonies, 1765*," was discovered by the Carnegie Institution among the archives of the *Service Hydrographique de la Marine*, Paris, and has

just appeared in the *American Historical Review*, for July and October, 1921. The manuscript consists of 79 pages, but the most interesting section is the writer's eye-witness account of Patrick Henry's speech in the House of Burgesses of Virginia, May 30, 1765. In the language of Dr. J. Franklin Jameson, Director of the Department of Historical Research, Carnegie Institution, "It is a remarkable chance that further information respecting that debate should come to light, after this distance of time, from a source so unexpected."

The sources of our information hitherto relative to this familiar speech are carefully set forth by Dr. Jameson in his introduction to the document. It appears that the first published account of the alleged speech was a private letter published in part in England and later in New York. Not until 1788 did any statement of the occurrence appear in a book. In 1805 John Burk quotes Mr. Henry's speech substantially as we are familiar with it, but there are evidences that Mr. Burk is not a trustworthy authority. The authority which the historians have accepted is William Wirt's "Life of Patrick Henry."

In that text the author says:

"It was in the midst of this magnificent debate, while he was descanting on the tyranny of the obnoxious act, that he exclaimed, in a voice of thunder and with the look of a god, 'Cæsar had his Brutus, Charles the First his Cromwell, and George the Third'—('Treason!' cried the Speaker; 'Treason! Treason!' echoed from every part of the House. It was one of those trying moments which is decisive of character. Henry faltered not an instant; but, rising to a loftier attitude and fixing on the Speaker an eye of the most determined fire, he finished his sentence with the firmest emphasis)—'*may profit by their example. If this be treason, make the most of it.*'"

Wirt was not a witness of the event. Indeed, in a foot-note he says:

"I had frequently heard the above anecdote of the cry of treason, but with such variations of the concluding words that I began to doubt whether the whole might not be fiction. With a view to ascertain the truth, therefore, I submitted it to Mr. Jefferson, as it had been given to me by Judge Tyler, and this is his answer: 'I well remember the cry of treason, the pause of Mr. Henry at the name of George III, and the presence of mind with which he closed his sentence and baffled the charge vociferated.' The incident, therefore, becomes authentic history."

The interest in this foot-note lies in the fact that both John Tyler the elder, then age eighteen, and Thomas Jefferson, age twenty-three, heard the speech. But later, in writing his biography, Jefferson refers to Wirt for the details of the matter. Dr. Jameson adds, "Apparently the account of these two eye-witnesses is confirmed in a manuscript letter to Wirt, by Paul Carrington, who also was an eye-witness, indeed a member of the House."

And yet Mr. Edmund Randolph, who died in 1813, left a manuscript, still unpublished, entitled a "History of Virginia," in which Henry is credited with an utterance somewhat less inflammatory than that long accepted. We seem, therefore, to be confronted with the fact that our familiar picture of that memorable Virginia session has never been wholly authoritative.

The author of this newly discovered manuscript, himself a Catholic, perhaps an Irishman, was, it would appear, an agent of the French Government. It would seem, therefore, that he must have been friendly to the Colonies. His whole manuscript shows that he was a careful observer. His notes, under date of May 30 and May 31, follow: (The foot-notes are from those of the editor of the *Review*.)

"May the 30th.—Set out Early from halfway house in the Chair and broke fast at York, arrived at Williamsburg at 12, where I saw three Negroes hanging at the gallows for having robbed Mr. Walthoe⁸² of 300 ps. I went immediately to the assembly which was sitting, where I was entertained with very strong Debates Concerning Dutys that the parlement wants to lay on the american Colonys, which they Call or Stile stamp Dutys. Shortly after I Came in one of the members stood up and said he had read that in former times tarquin and Julius had their Brutus, Charles had his Cromwell, and he Did not Doubt but some good american would stand up, in favour of his Country, but (says he) in a more moderate manner, and was going to Continue, when the speaker of the house rose and Said, he, the last that stood up had spoke treason, and was sorey to see that not one of the members of the house was loyal Enough to stop him, before he had gone so far. upon which the Same member stood up again (his name is henery) and said that if he had affronted the speaker, or the house, he was ready to ask pardon, and he would shew his loyalty to his majesty King G. the third, at the Expençe of the last Drop of his blood, but what he had said must be attributed to the Interest of his Countrys Dying liberty which he had at heart, and the heat of passion might have lead him to have said something more than he intended, but, again, if he said any thing wrong, he begged the speaker and the houses pardon. some other Members stood up and backed him, on which that affaire was dropped.

"May the 31th.—I returned to the assembly today, and heard very hot Debates stil about the Stamp Dutys. the whole house was for Entering resolves on the records but they Differed much with regard the Contents or purport thereof. some were for shewing their resentment to the highest. one of the resolves that these proposed, was that any person that would offer to sustain that the parlement of Engl'd had a right to impose or lay any tax or Dutys what'sr on the american Colonys, without the Consent of the inhabitants therof, Should be looked upon as a traitor, and Deemed an Enemy to his Country.⁸⁴

⁸² Nathaniel Walthoe, clerk of the council.

⁸⁴ This was the resolve which we may call no. 7, reckoning all that are quoted in any of the authorities. . . . Our traveller, however, appears to have seen no. 7 under debate on the 31st. The dissolution occurred the next day, June 1.

there were some others to the same purpose, and the majority was for Entering these resolves, upon which the Governor Dissolved the assembly, which hindered their proceeding.

"The Kings Berth Night⁸⁶ which was on the tuesday follow'g, was given by the lieutenant governor mr. faquier.⁸⁶ I went there in Expectation of seeing a great Deal of Company, but was Disappointed for there was not above a Dozen of people. I came away before super."

THE NOBEL PEACE PRIZE

THE Nobel Peace Prize for the current year, according to the announcement from Christiania, Norway, December 10, has been divided equally between Christian L. Langé, of Norway, Secretary of the Interparliamentary Union, and Hjalmer Branting, Prime Minister of Sweden. The prize amounts to approximately \$30,000.

Dr. Langé was born in Norway in 1869. He has been Secretary of the Interparliamentary Union since 1909. He has been Secretary of the Nobel Committee in the Storting, and for some years he has been professor of history in the Norwegian Nobel Institute at Christiania. He represented Norway at the second Peace Congress at The Hague in 1907. He is the author of a number of volumes and many articles relating to international matters. His friends among the American group of the Interparliamentary Union are pleased to hear of the award even of a half of the Nobel Peace Prize to Dr. Langé.

WHAT IS IT?

WHAT IS IT that led President Harding to say in his speech on Armistice Day that he is "not as a pacifist fearing war"? What is it that led President John Sullivan, of the Central Trades and Labor Council of New York, in his appeal to civic, school, church, veteran, and business organizations to aid in impressing upon the International Conference for the Limitation of Armament the demand for the cessation of the competitive building of great armaments, to say, "We have put the bars up against all pacifist organizations and will not take counsel with any such or similar organizations"? These gentlemen and public men generally are doing everything in their power just now to avoid the calamity of war. As such, they are working for the establishment of peace between nations. The statesmanship of the world, without any appreciable exception, is bent as never before upon the same high purpose.

The psychology of nations everywhere is, therefore, the psychology of pacifism. No one today, outside a few

⁸⁶ George III. was born June 4 (N. S.), 1738.

⁸⁶ Francis Fauquier.